

*Talk at the conference “Journées 2004: Systèmes de référence spatio-temporels,”
l’Observatoire de Paris, 20 – 22 septembre 2004.*

On the theory of canonical perturbations and its application to Earth rotation. A source of inaccuracy in the calculation of the angular velocity

Michael Efroimsky

US Naval Observatory, Washington DC 20392 USA, e-mail: me @ usno.navy.mil

February 2, 2008

Abstract

Both orbital and rotational dynamics employ the method of variation of parameters. We express, in a non-perturbed setting, the coordinates (Cartesian, in the orbital case, or Eulerian in the rotation case) via the time and six adjustable constants called elements (orbital elements or rotational elements). If, under disturbance, we use this expression as ansatz and endow the “constants” with time dependence, then the perturbed velocity (Cartesian or angular) will consist of a partial derivative with respect to time and a so-called convective term, one that includes the time derivatives of the variable “constants.” Out of sheer convenience, the so-called Lagrange constraint is often imposed. It nullifies the convective term and, thereby, guarantees that the functional dependence of the velocity upon the time and “constants” stays, under perturbation, the same as it used to be in the undisturbed setting. The variable “constants” obeying this condition are called osculating elements. Otherwise, they are simply called orbital or rotational elements.

When the dynamical equations, written in terms of the “constants,” are demanded to be symplectic (and the “constants” make conjugated pairs Q, P), these “constants” are called Delaunay elements, in the orbital case, or Andoyer elements, in the rotational case. The Andoyer and Delaunay sets of elements share a feature not readily apparent: in certain cases, the standard equations render these elements non-osculating.

In orbital mechanics, the elements, calculated via the standard planetary equations, come out non-osculating when perturbations depend on velocities. This complication often arises but seldom gets noticed. To keep elements osculating under such perturbations, extra terms must enter the equations, terms that will **not** be parts of the disturbing function (Efroimsky & Goldreich 2003, 2004). In the case of parametrisation through the Kepler elements, this will merely complicate the equations. In the case of Delaunay parametrisation, these extra terms will not only complicate the Delaunay equations, but will also destroy their canonicity. Under velocity-dependent disturbances, the osculation and canonicity conditions are incompatible.

Similarly, in rotational dynamics, the Andoyer elements come out non-osculating when the perturbation depends upon the angular velocity of the top. Since a switch to a non-inertial frame is an angular-velocity-dependent perturbation, then amendment of the dynamical equations by only adding extra terms to the Hamiltonian makes these equations

render non-osculating Andoyer elements. To make them osculating, extra terms must be added to the dynamical equations (and then these equations will no longer be symplectic).

Calculations in terms of non-osculating variables are mathematically valid, but their physical interpretation is problematic. Non-osculating orbital elements parametrise instantaneous conics **not** tangent to the orbit. Their inclination, the non-osculating i , may differ much from the physical inclination of the orbit, given by the osculating i . Similarly, in the case of rotation, non-osculating Andoyer variables do correctly describe a perturbed spin but lack simple physical meaning. The customary expressions for the spin-axis' orientation, in terms of the Andoyer elements, will no longer be valid, if the elements are non-osculating. These expressions, though, will stay valid for osculating elements, but then the (correct) dynamical equations for such elements will no longer be canonical – circumstance ignored in the Kinoshita-Souchay (KS) theory which tacitly employs non-osculating variables. While the loss of osculation will not influence the predictions for the figure axis of the planet, it considerably effects the predictions for the orientation of the instantaneous axis of rotation.

1 Kepler and Euler

In orbital dynamics, a Keplerian conic, emerging as an undisturbed two-body orbit, is regarded as a sort of “elementary motion,” so that all the other available motions are conveniently considered as distortions of such conics, distortions implemented through endowing the orbital constants C_j with their own time dependence. Points of the orbit can be contributed by the “elementary curves” either in a non-osculating fashion, as in Fig. 1, or in the osculating way, as in Fig. 2.

The disturbances, causing the evolution of the motion from one instantaneous conic to another, are the primary's oblateness, the gravitational pull of other bodies, the atmospheric and radiation-caused drag, and the non-inertiality of the reference system.

Similarly, in rotational dynamics, a complex spin can be presented as a sequence of configurations borrowed from a family of some elementary rotations. The easiest possibility here will be to employ in this role the Eulerian cones, i.e., the loci of the rotational axis, corresponding to non-perturbed spin states. These are the simple motions exhibited by an undeformable free top with no torques acting thereupon.¹ Then, to implement a perturbed motion, we shall have to go from one Eulerian cone to another, just as in Fig. 1 and 2 we go from one Keplerian ellipse to another. Hence, similar to those pictures, a smooth “walk” over the instantaneous Eulerian cones may be osculating or non-osculating.

The physical torques, the actual triaxiality of the top, and the non-inertial nature of the reference frame will then be regarded as perturbations causing the “walk.” The latter two perturbations depend not only upon the rotator's orientation but also upon its angular velocity.

2 Delaunay and Andoyer

In orbital dynamics, we can express the Lagrangian of the reduced two-body problem via the spherical coordinates $q_j = \{r, \varphi, \theta\}$, then calculate their conjugated momenta p_j and the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}(q, p)$, and then carry out the Hamilton-Jacobi procedure (Plummer 1918), to arrive to the Delaunay variables

$$\{Q_1, Q_2, Q_3; P_1, P_2, P_3\} \equiv \{L, G, H; l, g, h\} =$$

¹ Here one opportunity will be to employ in the role of “elementary” motions the non-circular Eulerian cones described by the actual triaxial top, when this top is unforced. Another opportunity will be to use, as “elementary” motions, the circular Eulerian cones described by a dynamically symmetrical top (and to treat its actual triaxiality as another perturbation). The main result of our paper will be invariant under this choice.

(1)

$$\{ \sqrt{\mu a} , \sqrt{\mu a (1 - e^2)} , \sqrt{\mu a (1 - e^2)} \cos i ; -M_o , -\omega , -\Omega \} ,$$

where μ denotes the reduced mass.

Similarly, in rotational dynamics one can define a spin state of a top by means of the three Euler angles $q_j = \psi, \theta, \varphi$ and their canonical momenta p_j , and then perform a canonical transformation to the Andoyer elements L, G, H, l, g, h . A minor technicality is that, historically, these variables were introduced by Andoyer (1923) in a manner slightly different from the set of canonical constants: while, for a free rotator, the three Andoyer variables G, H, h are constants, the other three, L, l, g do evolve in time (for the Andoyer Hamiltonian of a free top is not zero,




Fig.1. The perturbed trajectory is a set of points belonging to a sequence of confocal instantaneous ellipses. The ellipses are **not** supposed to be tangent, nor even coplanar to the orbit at the intersection point. As a result, the physical velocity $\dot{\vec{r}}$ (tangent to the trajectory at each of its points) differs from the Keplerian velocity $\vec{g}$ (tangent to the ellipse). To parametrise the depicted sequence of non-osculating ellipses, and to single it out of all the other such sequences, it is suitable to employ the difference between $\dot{\vec{r}}$ and $\vec{g}$, expressed as a function of time and six (non-osculating) orbital elements:

$$\vec{\Phi}(t, C_1, \dots, C_6) = \dot{\vec{r}}(t, C_1, \dots, C_6) - \vec{g}(t, C_1, \dots, C_6) .$$

Since

$$\dot{\vec{r}} = \frac{\partial \vec{r}}{\partial t} + \sum_{j=1}^6 \frac{\partial C_j}{\partial t} \dot{C}_j = \vec{g} + \sum_{j=1}^6 \frac{\partial C_j}{\partial t} \dot{C}_j ,$$

then the difference $\vec{\Phi}$ is simply the convective term $\sum (\partial \vec{r} / \partial C_j) \dot{C}_j$ which emerges whenever the instantaneous ellipses are being gradually altered by the perturbation (and the orbital elements become time-dependent). In the literature, $\vec{\Phi}(t, C_1, \dots, C_6)$ is called the gauge function or gauge velocity or, simply, gauge.




Fig.2. The perturbed trajectory is represented through a sequence of confocal instantaneous ellipses which are tangent to the trajectory at the intersection points, i.e., are osculating. Now, the physical velocity $\dot{\vec{r}}$ (which is tangent to the trajectory) will coincide with the Keplerian velocity $\vec{g}$ (which is tangent to the ellipse), so that their difference $\vec{\Phi}(t, C_1, \dots, C_6)$ vanishes everywhere:

$$\vec{\Phi}(t, C_1, \dots, C_6) \equiv \dot{\vec{r}}(t, C_1, \dots, C_6) - \vec{g}(t, C_1, \dots, C_6) = \sum_{j=1}^6 \frac{\partial C_j}{\partial t} \dot{C}_j = 0 .$$

This equality, called Lagrange constraint or Lagrange gauge, is the necessary and sufficient condition of osculation.

but a function of l , L and G). This way, to make our analogy complete, we may carry out one more canonical transformation, from the Andoyer variables $\{L, G, H, l, g, h\}$ to “almost Andoyer” variables $\{L_o, G, H, l_o, g_o, h\}$, where L_o , l_o and g_o are the initial values of L , l and g . The latter set consists only of the constants of integration; the corresponding Hamiltonian becomes nil. Therefore, these constants are the true analogues of the Delaunay variables (while the conventional Andoyer set is analogous to the Delaunay set with M used instead of M_o). The main result obtained below for the modified Andoyer set $\{L_o, G, H, l_o, g_o, h\}$ can be easily modified for the regular Andoyer set of variables $\{L, G, H, l, g, h\}$. (Efroimsky 2005b)

To summarise this section, in both cases we start out with

$$\dot{q} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}^{(o)}}{\partial p} \quad , \quad \dot{p} = - \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}^{(o)}}{\partial q} \quad . \quad (2)$$

q and p being the coordinates and their conjugated momenta, in the orbital case, or the Euler angles and their momenta, in the rotation case. Then we switch, via a canonical transformation

$$\begin{aligned} q &= f(Q, P, t) \\ p &= \chi(Q, P, t) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

to

$$\dot{Q} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}^*}{\partial P} = 0 \quad , \quad \dot{P} = - \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}^*}{\partial Q} = 0 \quad , \quad \mathcal{H}^* = 0 \quad , \quad (4)$$

where Q and P denote the set of Delaunay elements, in the orbital case, or the (modified, as explained above) Andoyer set $\{L_o, G, H, l_o, g_o, h\}$, in the case of rigid-body rotation.

This scheme relies on the fact that, for an unperturbed Keplerian orbit (and, similarly, for an undisturbed Eulerian cone) its six-constant parametrisation may be chosen so that:

- 1.** the parameters are constants and, at the same time, are canonical variables $\{Q, P\}$ with a zero Hamiltonian: $\mathcal{H}^*(Q, P) = 0$;
- 2.** for constant Q and P , the transformation equations (3) are mathematically equivalent to the dynamical equations (2).

3 When do the elements come out non-osculating?

3.1 General-type motion

Under perturbation, the “constants” Q, P begin to evolve so that, after their substitution into

$$\begin{aligned} q &= f(Q(t), P(t), t) \\ p &= \chi(Q(t), P(t), t) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

(f and χ being the same functions as in (3)), the resulting motion obeys the disturbed equations

$$\dot{q} = \frac{\partial (\mathcal{H}^{(o)} + \Delta \mathcal{H})}{\partial p} \quad , \quad \dot{p} = - \frac{\partial (\mathcal{H}^{(o)} + \Delta \mathcal{H})}{\partial q} \quad . \quad (6)$$

We also want our “constants” Q and P to remain canonical and to obey

$$\dot{Q} = \frac{\partial (\mathcal{H}^* + \Delta \mathcal{H}^*)}{\partial P} \quad , \quad \dot{P} = - \frac{\partial (\mathcal{H}^* + \Delta \mathcal{H}^*)}{\partial Q} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}^* = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta\mathcal{H}^*(Q, P, t) = \Delta\mathcal{H}(q(Q, P, t), p(Q, P, t), t) \quad . \quad (8)$$

Above all, an optimist will expect that the perturbed “constants” $C_j \equiv Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, P_1, P_2, P_3$ (the Delaunay elements, in the orbital case, or the modified Andoyer elements, in the rotation case) will remain osculating. This means that the perturbed velocity will be expressed by the same function of $C_j(t)$ and t as the unperturbed one used to. Let us check to what extent this optimism is justified. The perturbed velocity reads

$$\dot{q} = g + \Phi \quad (9)$$

where

$$g(C(t), t) \equiv \frac{\partial q(C(t), t)}{\partial t} \quad (10)$$

is the functional expression for the unperturbed velocity; and

$$\Phi(C(t), t) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^6 \frac{\partial q(C(t), t)}{\partial C_j} \dot{C}_j(t) \quad (11)$$

is the convective term. Since we chose the “constants” C_j to make canonical pairs (Q, P) obeying (7 - 8), with vanishing $\mathcal{H}^*$, then insertion of (7) into (22) will result in

$$\Phi = \sum_{n=1}^3 \frac{\partial q}{\partial Q_n} \dot{Q}_n(t) + \sum_{n=1}^3 \frac{\partial q}{\partial P_n} \dot{P}_n(t) = \frac{\partial \Delta\mathcal{H}(q, p)}{\partial p} \quad . \quad (12)$$

So the canonicity demand is incompatible with osculation. In other words, whenever a momentum-dependent perturbation is present, we still can use the ansatz (5) for calculation of the coordinates and momenta, but can no longer use (14) for calculating the velocities. Instead, we must use (13). Application of this machinery to the case of orbital motion is depicted on Fig.1. Here the constants $C_j = (Q_n, P_n)$ parametrise instantaneous ellipses which, for nonzero Φ , are **not** tangent to the trajectory. (For more details see Efroimsky & Goldreich (2003).) In the case of orbital motion, the situation will be similar, except that, instead of the instantaneous Keplerian conics, one will deal with instantaneous Eulerian cones (i.e., with the loci of the rotational axis, corresponding to non-perturbed spin states).

3.2 Orbital motion

In the orbital-motion case, osculation means the following. Let the unperturbed position be given, in some fixed Cartesian frame, by vector function $\vec{f}$:

$$\vec{r} = \vec{f}(C_1, \dots, C_6, t) \quad , \quad \vec{r} \equiv \{x, y, z\} \quad . \quad (13)$$

Employing this functional ansatz also under disturbance, we get the perturbed velocity as

$$\dot{\vec{r}} = \vec{g}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) + \vec{\Phi}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) \quad (14)$$

where

$$\vec{g} \equiv \frac{\partial \vec{f}}{\partial t} \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\Phi} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^6 \frac{\partial \vec{f}}{\partial C_j} \dot{C}_j \quad . \quad (15)$$

The osculation condition is a convenient (but totally arbitrary!) demand that the perturbed velocity $\dot{\vec{r}}$ has the same functional dependence upon t and C_j as the unperturbed velocity $\vec{g}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{r}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) &= \vec{f}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) \quad , \\ \dot{\vec{r}}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) &= \vec{g}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) \quad .\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

or, equivalently, that the so-called Lagrange constraint is satisfied:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\partial \vec{f}}{\partial C_j} \dot{C}_j = \vec{\Phi}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) \quad \text{where} \quad \vec{\Phi} = 0 \quad .\tag{17}$$

Fulfilment of these expectations, however, should in no way be taken for granted, because the Lagrange constraint (17) and the canonicity demand (7 - 8) are now two independent conditions whose compatibility is not guaranteed. As shown in Efroimsky (2002a,b), this problem has gauge freedom, which means that any arbitrary choice of the gauge function $\vec{\Phi}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t)$ will render, after substitution into (13 - 14), the same values for $\vec{r}$ and $\dot{\vec{r}}$ as were rendered by Lagrange's choice (17).² As can be seen from (12), **the assumption, that the “constants” Q and P are canonical, fixes the non-Lagrange gauge**

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\partial \vec{f}}{\partial C_j} \dot{C}_j = \vec{\Phi}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) \quad \text{where} \quad \vec{\Phi} = \frac{\partial \Delta \mathcal{H}}{\partial \vec{p}} \quad .\tag{18}$$

It is easy to show (Efroimsky & Goldreich 2003; Efroimsky 2005b) that this same non-Lagrange gauge simultaneously guarantees fulfilment of the momentum-osculation condition:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{r}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) &= \vec{f}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) \quad , \\ \vec{p}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) &= \vec{g}(C_1(t), \dots, C_6(t), t) \quad .\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

Any gauge different from (18), will prohibit the canonicity of the elements. In particular, for momentum-dependent $\Delta \mathcal{H}$, the choice of osculation condition $\vec{\Phi} = 0$ would violate canonicity.

For example, an attempt of a Hamiltonian description of orbits about a precessing oblate primary will bring up the following predicament. On the one hand, it is most natural and convenient to define the Delaunay elements in a co-precessing (equatorial) coordinate system. On the other hand, these elements will not be osculating in the frame wherein they were introduced, and therefore their physical interpretation will be difficult, if at all possible. Indeed, instantaneous ellipses on Fig.1 may cross the trajectory at whatever angles (and may be even perpendicular thereto). Thence, their orbital elements will not describe the real orientation or shape of the physical trajectory (Efroimsky & Goldreich 2004; Efroimsky 2005a).

For the first time, non-osculating elements obeying (22) implicitly emerged in (Goldreich 1965) and then in Brumberg et al (1971), though their exact definition in terms of gauge freedom was not yet known at that time. Both authors noticed that these elements were not osculating. Brumberg (1992) called them “contact elements.” The osculating and contact variables coincide when the disturbance is velocity-independent. Otherwise, they differ already in the first order of the velocity-dependent perturbation. Luckily, in some situations their secular parts differ only in the second order (Efroimsky 2005a), a fortunate circumstance anticipated yet by Goldreich (1965).

² Physically, this simply means, $\dot{\vec{r}}$ on Fig.1 can be decomposed into $\vec{g}$ and $\vec{\Phi}$ in a continuous variety of ways. Mathematically, this freedom reflects a more general construction that emerges in the ODE theory. (Newman & Efroimsky 2003)

3.3 Rotational motion

In rotational dynamics, the situation of an axially symmetric unsupported top at each instant of time is fully defined by the three Euler angles $q_n = \theta, \phi, \psi$ and their derivatives $\dot{q}_n = \dot{\theta}, \dot{\phi}, \dot{\psi}$. The time dependence of these six quantities can be calculated from three dynamical equations of the second order and will, therefore, depend upon the time and six integration constants:

$$q_n = f_n(S_1, \dots, S_6, t) \quad , \quad (20)$$

$$\dot{q}_n = g_n(S_1, \dots, S_6, t) \quad ,$$

the functions g_n and f_n being interconnected via $g_n \equiv \partial f_n / \partial t$, for $n = 1, 2, 3 = \psi, \theta, \phi$.

Under disturbance, the motion will be altered:

$$q_n = f_n(S_1(t), \dots, S_6(t), t) \quad , \quad (21)$$

$$\dot{q}_n = g_n(S_1(t), \dots, S_6(t), t) + \Phi_n(S_1(t), \dots, S_6(t), t) \quad ,$$

where

$$\Phi_n(S_1(t), \dots, S_6(t), t) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^6 \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial S_j} \dot{S}_j \quad . \quad (22)$$

Now choose the “constants” S_j to make canonical pairs (Q, P) obeying (7 - 8), with $\mathcal{H}^*$ being zero for $(Q, P) = (L_o, G, H, l_o, g_o, h)$. Then insertion of (7) into (22) will result in

$$\Phi_n(S_1(t), \dots, S_6(t), t) \equiv \sum \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial Q} \dot{Q} + \sum \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial P} \dot{P} = \frac{\partial \Delta \mathcal{H}(q, p)}{\partial p_n} \quad , \quad (23)$$

so that the canonicity demand (7 - 8) violates the gauge freedom in a non-Lagrange fashion. This is merely a particular case of (12).

This yields two consequences. One is that, in the canonical formalism, calculation of the angular velocities via the elements must be performed not through the second equation of (20) but through the second equation of (21), with (23) substituted therein. This means, for example, that in Kinoshita (1977) expressions (2.6) and (6.24 - 6.27) render not the angular velocity of the Earth relative to the precessing frame (wherein the Andoyer variables were defined) but the angular velocity relative to an inertial frame. (For an extended explanation of this fact see Efroimsky 2005b.) This, however, is not a drawback of the Kinoshita-Souchay theory but rather its advantage, because it is the angular velocity relative to an inertial frame that is directly measurable. (Schreiber et al 2004)

The second consequence is that, if we wish to make our Andoyer variables osculating (so that the second equation of (20) could be used), the price to be paid for this repair will be the loss of canonicity. (Angular-velocity-dependent disturbances cannot be accounted for by merely amending the Hamiltonian!) The osculating elements will obey non-canonical dynamical equations.

To draw to a close, we would add that, under some special circumstances, the secular parts of contact elements may coincide in the first order with those of their osculating counterparts.³ Whether this will be the case for the Earth or Mars remains to be investigated. This matter will be crucial for examining the validity of the presently available computations of the history of Mars' obliquity.⁴

³ In regard to orbital motions, this possibility was anticipated yet in 1965 by Peter Goldreich. As demonstrated by Efroimsky (2005a), this is true for constant rate of frame precession (but not for variable precession).

⁴ The pioneer study on this topic was conducted by Ward (1973) in a direct manner and was, therefore, exempt from the problems associated with the loss of osculation. However, some of his successors chose the canonical formalism and exploited the Hamiltonian borrowed from the Kinoshita theory.

4 Conclusions

In this talk we have explained why the Hamiltonian theory of Earth rotation renders non-osculating Andoyer elements. We have also explained how this defect of the theory should be mended.

In attitude mechanics, osculation loss has the same consequences as in the theory of orbits: while this defect of the theory has no influence upon the theory's predictions for the figure axis of the planet, it considerably effects the predictions for the orientation of the instantaneous axis of rotation.

In our paper Efroimsky (2005b) we shall demonstrate that, even though the Andoyer variables in the Kinoshita-Souchay theory are introduced in the precessing frame of the Earth orbit, they return the angular velocity not relative to that frame, but relative to an inertial one. This is not a drawback of this theory but rather its advantage, because it is the angular velocity relative to an inertial frame that is directly measurable at present. (Schreiber et al 2004)

References

- [1] Andoyer, H. 1923. *Cours de Mécanique Céleste*, Paris. Gauthier-Villars 1923.
- [2] Brumberg, V. A., L. S. Evdokimova, & N. G. Kochina. 1971. "Analytical Methods for the Orbits of Artificial Satellites of the Moon." *Celestial Mechanics*, Vol. **3**, pp. 197 - 221.
- [3] Brumberg, V.A. 1992. *Essential Relativistic Celestial Mechanics*. Adam Hilger, Bristol.
- [4] Efroimsky, Michael. 2002a. "Equations for the orbital elements. Hidden symmetry." Preprint No 1844 of the Institute of Mathematics and its Applications, University of Minnesota <http://www.ima.umn.edu/preprints/feb02/feb02.html>
- [5] Efroimsky, Michael. 2002b. "The Implicit Gauge Symmetry Emerging in the N-body Problem of Celestial Mechanics." [astro-ph/0212245](http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0212245)
- [6] Efroimsky, M., & P. Goldreich. 2003. "Gauge Symmetry of the N-body Problem in the Hamilton-Jacobi Approach." *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, Vol. **44**, pp. 5958 - 5977 [astro-ph/0305344](http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0305344)
- [7] Efroimsky, M., & Goldreich, P. 2004. "Gauge Freedom in the N-body Problem of Celestial Mechanics." *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, Vol. **415**, pp. 1187 - 1199 [astro-ph/0307130](http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0307130)
- [8] Efroimsky, M. 2005a. "Long-term evolution of orbits about a precessing oblate planet. The case of uniform precession." *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy*, Vol.**91**, pp.75-108 [astro-ph/0408168](http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0408168)
- [9] Efroimsky, M. 2005b. "The theory of canonical perturbations applied to attitude dynamics and to the Earth rotation." [astro-ph/0506427](http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0506427)
- [10] Goldreich, P. 1965. "Inclination of satellite orbits about an oblate precessing planet." *The Astronomical Journal*, Vol. **70**, pp. 5 - 9.
- [11] Kinoshita, H. 1977. "Theory of the Rotation of the Rigid Earth." *Celestial Mechanics*, Vol. **15**, pp. 277 - 326

- [12] Newman, W., & M. Efroimsky. 2003. "The Method of Variation of Constants and Multiple Time Scales in Orbital Mechanics." *Chaos*, Vol. 13, pp. 476 - 485.
- [13] Plummer, H. C. 1918. *An Introductory Treatise on Dynamical Astronomy*. Cambridge University Press, UK.
- [14] Schreiber, K. U.; Velikoseltsev, A.; Rothacher, M.; Klugel, T.; Stedman, G. E.; & Wiltshire, D. L. 2004. "Direct Measurement of Diurnal Polar Motion by Ring Laser Gyroscopes." *Journal of Geophysical Research*, Vol. **109**, p. B06405
- [15] Ward, W. 1973. "Large-scale Variations in the Obliquity of Mars." *Science*. Vol. **181**, pp. 260 - 262.